THE EFFECT OF FOCUSED WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS ON EFL LEARNERS' ACQUISITION OF VERB TENSES

Shahram Afraz
Islamic Azad University
Qeshm Branch
Qeshm, IRAN
a.sh32@rocketmail.com

Hamed Ghaemi
Islamic Azad University
Gonabad Branch
Gonabad, IRAN
hamedghaemi@ymail.com

Abstract

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of the written corrective feedback with the focus on teaching Contrastive Analysis helps and magnifies the effects of the corrective feedback on the acquisition of verb tenses(the focus of this research is on the perfect tenses, including past, present and future) by adult intermediate ESL learners (N= 30). There was only one experimental group in this study, which received the treatment. In the end of the study, it was concluded that the performance of the participant was highly positive towards the treatment received and they were highly conscious while choosing the correct and relevant verb tenses during the posttest. It showed that the learners gained high language analytic ability and they somehow became alert about the differences in the two languages.

Key Words: Focused Corrective Feedback, Contrastive analysis, Verb Tenses, Language Acquisition.

INTRODUCTION

With the rise of communicative methodology in the late 1970s, the role of grammar instruction in second language learning was downplayed, and it was even suggested that teaching grammar was not only unhelpful but might actually be detrimental. However, recent research has demonstrated the need for formal instruction for learners to attain high levels of accuracy (H. Nassaji &S. Fotos).

As an important part of the grammar, verb tenses are the component which have a main role in distinguishing a text accurate, but since they are usually not taught particularly compared with more complicated forms and structures, most ESL and EFL learners get to the high levels but they are not alert enough regarding the verb tenses, especially concerning the differences of the verb tenses (here perfect ones) used in the first and the second language (L1 and L2). And they still need to be corrected. Yet, this article is not specifically concerning the writing, but since the perfect verb tenses and the use of them is so important when articulating language, it is good to know that over the past several decades, there has been considerable attention given to written corrective feedback (WCF) in second language writing (L2). Actually, Corrective feedback is a long-standing educational practice that can arguably be linked to almost everything we learn (Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum, & Wolfersberger, 2010; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). According to Russell and Spada (2006), in language learning "the term corrective feedback [refers] to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (p. 134). That is why in this research we focus on the role of the corrective feedback on learning the perfect verb tenses and teaching Contrastive Analysis of the verb tenses in the two languages, here are English and Persian, and the how it constitutes the analytic ability of the ESL learners.

The current research is relevant to writing pedagogy, considering that such pedagogy aims to improve students' written grammatical accuracy. And, particularly its purpose is to examine the role of corrective

feedback (CF) in L2 acquisition in the form of applying written CF and teaching CA. However, it should be stated here that writing is a complex activity, and writing teachers view CF more broadly than second language acquisition (SLA) researchers (Sheen, 2007a).

As mentioned before, considering the role of such research in the writing pedagogy and the role of its result in teaching grammar, here the verb tenses, and teaching CA and its role in activating the learners analytic ability, conducting this research plays an important role in writing pedagogy.

Also, considering the debates about the written corrective feedback (WCF) in writing, it has been questioned if it could be given to students at higher levels too, or it should only be given at beginning levels.

Considering the Truscott's (1996) review of written CF studies and his controversial conclusion that written CF is ineffective and even harmful in promoting L2 acquisition constituted a challenge to researchers, it is good to make sure about such controversies.

Research Question(s)
This study attempts to address some of the problems arose in written CF research by using the methodology and the theory of oral CF research in SLA and by addressing teaching CA and its role in activating the analytical ability of the student which can affect the CF role. This research considers the following questions:
1- Is focusing on the written corrective feedback of the verb tenses with the view of CA influential and beneficial in intermediate ESL learners' acquisition of English verb tenses?
2- Is written corrective feedback of the contrastive analysis of the two languages' verb tenses effective in ESL learners' acquisition at higher levels than the beginning ones?

Given this fact that corrective feedback is somehow relevant to almost whatever we learn, it is assumed that the answer to the first question is yes. And by focusing on the written corrective feedback of contrastive analysis, the instructors of the ESL and the practitioners can use this method to enhance their ESL learners' acquisition.

And regarding the second research question, it is also believed that there would not be a high difference between young learners or adult ones, or beginners or the ones at higher level, and this method works for all levels.

Review of Literature
In spite of this fact that there have been over two decades of research and writing, there have been so many inconsistencies in the research that still make it unclear what role WCF should play in the language classroom. Some researchers have stepped forward in strong support of WCF (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener&Knoch, 2009a, 2009b; Chandler, 2003; Ellis, Erlam, &Loewen, 2006; Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 1997; Ferris & Roberts, 2001, 2004; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Lalande, 1984; Polio & Sachs, 2007; Sheen, 2007). Others have argued against it for various reasons (Kepner, 1991; Robb, Ross, &Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007; Zamel, 1985). Some researchers have neither supported nor opposed WCF, but have demanded instead careful reanalysis of the published studies, arguing that the variations and inconsistencies in them negate the possibility of reaching any real conclusions on the matter (Bruton, 2009; Ferris, 2004; Guénette, 2007; Hyland & Hyland, 2002; Russell &Spada, 2006). It is to review some of these studies in detail.

Theoretical Background
Corrective Feedback
Corrective feedback has been an important practice in second language classrooms. It refers to the responses to a learner's nontargetlike L2 production in L2 acquisition.

Two major types of interactional feedback are recasts and elicitations, which have also been considered as pedagogically useful strategies in communicative language classrooms (Doughty, 2001, 2003; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Gass, 2003). Recasts refer to feedback that reformulates a learner's nontargetlike utterance into a targetlike one (Nicholas, Lightbown, &Spada, 2001). Recasts were considered indirect. When an interlocutor

reformulates a learner's error, the reformulation may draw the learner's attention to the target form by signaling to the learner that his or her utterance is deviant in some way (Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998). Recasts may provide learners with opportunities for modified output, which has been suggested to be crucial for L2 development (Doughty, 2001; Swain, 1995; Nassaji, 2009). On the other hand, elicitations refer to feedback that does not correctly reformulate the learner's error pushes the learner to reformulate it (Loewen&Philp, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Nassaji, 2007). Elicitation strategies include self-repair, promoting and providing learners with opportunities to test and revise their hypotheses about the target language (Lyster, 2004; Lyster&Ranta, 1997). Elicitations also provide opportunities for negotiation of form through various forms of requests for clarification and correction (Lyster&Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 1998).

The effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback differ on SLA. Implicit feedback often takes the form of recasts, in which there is no overt indicator that an error has been committed. Explicit feedback, on the other hand, can take explicit correction, in which the response clearly indicates that what the learner said was incorrect, or metalinguistic feedback, defined by Lyster and Ranta (1997) as "comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the learner's utterance" (p. 47). In L2 classroom practices, some recasts are explicitly corrective. As Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) point out in their review of research on corrective feedback, the recasts used in the different studies might not have been equivalent in their degree of implicitness versus explicitness. If the L2 learner did not self-correct, recasts usually followed with emphatic stress to draw attention to the target or reformulated elements. Recasts work for SLA when learners notice the changes that have been made to their own utterances.

The major focus of studies that have investigated the effectiveness of different types of corrective feedback has been the extent to which direct or indirect feedback facilitates improved accuracy. Although these terms have not always been used consistently in the literature, direct corrective feedback may be defined as the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure above or near the linguistic error (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Ferris, 2003). It may include the crossing out of an unnecessary word/phrase/morpheme, the insertion of a missing word/phrase/morpheme, or the provision of the correct form or structure. Additional forms of direct feedback may include written meta-linguistic explanation (the provision of grammar rules and examples at the end of a student's script with a reference back to places in the text where the error has occurred) and/or oral meta-linguistic explanation (a mini-lesson where the rules and examples are presented, practiced, and discussed; one-on-one individual conferences between teacher and student or conferences between teacher and small groups of students).

On the other hand, indirect corrective feedback indicates that in some way an error has been made. This may be provided in one of four ways: underlining or circling the error; recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line; or using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Robb, Ross, &Shortreed, 1986). Rather than the teacher providing an explicit correction, students are left to resolve and correct the problem that has been drawn to their attention.

In earlier years, a stronger case had tended to be made for the special value of providing students with indirect feedback rather than direct feedback. Lalande (1982) and James (1998) explained that indirect feedback requires learners to engage in guided learning and problem solving and, therefore, promotes the type of reflection that is more likely to foster long-term acquisition. But as SLA researchers of oral L2 production have found, learners must first ''notice'' (Schmidt, 1990) that an error has been made. Once the error has been noted, indirect feedback has the potential to push learners to engage in hypothesis testing—a process which Ferris (2002) and others (see Doughty & Williams, 1998) suggest may induce deeper internal processing and promote the internalization of correct forms and structures.

While not dismissing the value of indirect feedback, those more in favor of a direct approach have explained that teachers and students prefer direct feedback (Ferris et al., 2000; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Komura, 1999). In addition, they suggest that direct feedback reduces the kind of confusion that can result when students fail to understand or remember the meaning of error codes used by teachers. Ferris and Roberts (2001) explain how this can easily occur with lower proficiency learners. Leki (1991) and Roberts (1999) have also pointed out that students sometimes feel that indirect feedback does not provide them with sufficient information to resolve

more complex errors such as idiosyncratic and syntactic errors. More recently, Chandler (2003) explained that the greater cognitive effort expended when students are required to use indirect feedback to make their own corrections is offset by the additional delay in knowing whether their own hypothesized correction is in fact correct. Weighing up the relative merits of the various claims is not possible, however, unless the findings of well-designed empirical studies are considered.

Though, Rod Ellis and Sheen (2008) have suggested a different classification for CF which is: focused and unfocused CF. The former corresponds to what might be considered normal practice in writing instruction (although not necessarily what L2 writing researchers advocate); teachers correct all (or at least a range of) the errors in learners' written work. This type of CF can be viewed as 'extensive' because it treats multiple errors. In contrast, focused CF selects specific errors to be corrected and ignores other errors. Highly focused CF will focus on a single error type (e.g. errors in the use of the past simple tense). Somewhat less focused CF will target more than one error type but will still restrict correction to a limited number of pre-selected types (e.g. simple past tense; articles; prepositions). Here are solid theoretical reasons for believing that focused CF will be more effective that unfocused CF. Learners are more likely to attend to corrections directed at a single (or a limited number of) error type(s) and more likely to develop a clearer understanding of the nature of the error and the correction needed. If attention and understanding are important for acquisition, as cognitive theories of L2 acquisition have claimed (e.g. Schmidt, 1994; Ellis, 2005), then focused CF is clearly better equipped to produce positive results.

Contrastive Analysis
Contrastive analysis was born as a result of a rather simple assumption. Aware of the sameerrors appearing so regularly and methodically in the works of increasing numbers of students, language teachers gradually came to assume that they could predict what mistakes the majority oflearners would make. From such mistakes, the assumption went on; teachers would be betterequipped to foresee difficulties and, consequently, would become wiser in directing learning andteaching efforts.

Contrastive Analysis (CA) became mainstream in the 1960s. According to Larsen-Freeman &Long (1991) in (Yoon, 2002), this was a time when structural linguistics and behavioral psychologywere rather dominant in the study of language learning. CA proponents came to advocate that L2instructional materials could be prepared more efficiently by comparing two languages and, in theprocess, predict learners' behaviors and difficulties. Some researchers even believed that whensimilarities and differences between an L1 and an L2 were taken into account; pedagogy could bemore effective and useful. Such arguments gave birth to the basic ideas of Contrastive AnalysisHypothesis (CAH), upon which CA is based. Lado's *Linguistics Across Cultures* (1957, p. 2) is thelandmark work which paved the way for CAH. According to this hypothesis, L1 transfer affectssecond language acquisition. Lado contends that "those elements that are similar to the [learner's] native language will be simple for him, and those areas that are different will be difficult."

The contrastive analysis hypothesis is based on two important assumptions. First, it is believed that the degree of difference between the two languages under analysis corresponds to the degree of difficulty. Second, the degree of similarity is advocated to correspond to the degree of simplicity. Therefore, the greater the differences, the more difficult it will be for the learner to learn a second language, and obviously the more similar the languages, the simpler it will be for the learners.

On the other hand, in the light of many contrastive studies (cf. James 1980; Fisiak 1981; Broselow 1984; Sajavaara 1984; Bot 1986; Odlin 1989; Leather and James 1991; Vroman 1990; Hayati 1995, among others)it has been proved that not all errors are as a result of interlingual interference. However, this does not imply that "interference" has no effect on the process of language learning.

Aside from the theoretical considerations, many people have experienced situations where they had difficulties in expressing themselves in the second language. For example, the answers to the question "how are you? "is " Thank you." In one language (L1), and "Good, thanks…" in another, say, English (L2). In a situation where such exchanges take place between a native and a non-native speaker, the chances are that the L2 learner, affected by the L1 structure, may automatically use the inappropriate answer, therefore, interference does inevitably

happen; but the question is when and where. Although there have been so many researches to clarify the limitations of CA, but it is still possible to predict in general that there will be difficulties in learning a second language in certain conditions. But, it is not so easy to predict the type and the source of error without experimental verification.

Operational Background

During the past two decades many researchers have conducted studies to evaluate the results of different kinds of FC, and also FC in different aspects of pedagogy, and other elements affecting it.

In 1996, Truscott declared that the provision of written corrective feedbackon ESL student writing was ineffective and harmful and that it shouldtherefore be abandoned. He maintained that there was empirical evidence (for example: Semke 1984; Robb,Ross, and Shortreed 1986;Kepner 1991) toshow that the practice was not worth continuing. Ferris (1999), in herresponse, pointed out, among a range of arguments, that the research basehe was drawing upon was too limited and conflicting in its findings and thatrestraint should be exercised while furtherinvestigations were undertaken. And that research evidence was limited in terms of the range of studies that hadattempted to address the question of efficacy and in terms of the quality of the research design.Of the studies that have been conducted until fairly recently, most, in termsof their design, execution, and analysis, were flawed to some extent (seeGuenette 2007; Bitchener 2008 for a review of these issues) so this hasmeant thatfirmconclusions about the efficacy ofwrittencorrective feedbackare not yet available.

Bitchener(2008) has presented a summary of the research done in this area by different scholars and the relative results of each. He also argues about the flaws of each.

Among these, Fathman and Whalley (1990) have concluded that WFC was effective. But Kepner (1991) gained the opposite result, and also Polio and his colleages (1998) gain the same result as Kepner. On the other hand, Ashwell (2000) and Ferris and Roberts (2001) have found WFC so effective.

There has been also some research done to compare different forms of WFC. Among them we can mention Lalande (1982), Ferris (1995), Ferris (1997), Ferris et al. (2000) and Chandler (2000), who almost all found it effective in pedagogy.

In a research conducted by Bitchener and Knoch(2008) on the value of a focused approach towritten corrective feedback, they found it so effective and that those who received writtencorrective feedback on the two functions outperformed the control group on allfour post-tests.

Sheen (2007) with a study with the same title as the current study found that written CF targeting a single linguistic feature improved learners' accuracy, especially when metalinguistic feedback was provided and thelearners had high language analytic ability.

Contrastive analysis used to be the major field in applied linguistics concerned with drawing the pedagogical implications of structural differences and similarities between languages. Its main objective was that of facilitating the learning of a second language. The literature of applied linguistics during fifties and sixties illustrates these concerns. The changing view of language and language learning brought by generative grammar has broadened the scope of contrastive analysis both in the direction of more theoretical objectives such as the search for linguistic universals in typology and in the direction of psycholinguistics concerned with the explanation of second language learning.

Although the influence of first language in learning a second language was known by such linguists and pioneers in the field of second language learning as Henry Sweet, Harold Palmer and Otto Jespersen, it was Lado (1957) who first stated this common observation of practicing teachers in stating that:

…. Individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture – both productively and receptively… that we

can predict and describe the patterns that will cause difficulty in learning by comparing systematically the language and culture to be learned with the native language and culture….(p. 2).

And with this statement the well-known contrastive analysis hypothesis was established. Moreover, it was Fries (1948) who first realized the pedagogical implications of the hypothesis, declaring that "the most effective materials are those that are based on a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner" and thereby establishing contrastive analysis as an integral component of the methodology of second language teaching.

METHODOLOGY

Design
This study used a quasi-experimental research design with a pretest–treatment–posttest–structure, using intact ESL classroom. For two weeks, they received two sessions of CF of contrastive analysis on perfect verb tenses , and then finished with an immediate posttest.

Setting
The study is carried out in two classes of ESL students, at English Institute. The number of the students in each class was 15. The researcher asked the teachers to apply the instructions in the classes, and administrated the exams directly. These students were of intermediate level.

Participants
The participants were all girls of different ages and educations, but almost all at the same level of English accuracy and knowledge. The age ranged from 24 to 45.

Operationalizations
In this study, we used the direct correction, which is a traditional error correction strategythat consists of indicating the location of an error on the student's textand the provision of the correct form by deleting and/or replacing theerror or by adding a linguistic element.

Target Structure
Articles were chosen as the target structure for the current study regarding isolating the effect of error correction from any potential effectof any vocabulary knowledge in general. The reason for this decision is revealed as participating students in any way in the research away from the effect of the vocabulary which they might had problem knowing or even worked with during the semester, and knowing the verb tenses structure in the second language helps the students produce decent language in their L2 learning process and after that. Learners have been observed to experience difficulty in learningspecific verb tenses because of their complex nature; that is, the choice of a verb tense is determined by both linguistic and pragmatic factors (Butler, 2002; Liu& Gleason, 2002).

Instruments and Procedures
Since there were only two treatment sessions, in each there was a narrative stimulus to elicit verb tense errors form the learners, but since the focus of this study was on the specific verb tenses only, the complete accuracy of the writings were not aimed, and the main focus remained on the accuracy of the verb tenses.

we chose two stories of the Aesop's fable, " the Wolf and the Lamb" :
Once upon a time a Wolf was lapping at a spring on ahillside, when, looking up, what should he see but a Lambjust beginning to drink a little lower down. 'There's mysupper,' thought he, 'if only I can find some excuse toseize it.' Then he called out to the Lamb, 'How dare youmuddle the water from which I am drinking?'

'No, master, nO,' said Lambikin; 'if the water bemuddy up there, I cannot be the cause of it, for it runsdown from you to me.'

'Well, then,' said the Wolf, 'why did you call me badnames this time last year?'

'That cannot be,' said the Lamb; 'I am only six monthsold.'
'I don't care,' snarled the Wolf; 'if it was not you it wasyour father;' and with that he rushed upon the poor littleLamb and .WARRA WARRAWARRAWARRAWARRA .ate her all up. But before she died she gaspedout.'Any excuse will serve a tyrant.'

And "The Dog and the Shadow":
It happened that a Dog had got a piece of meat and wascarrying it home in his mouth to eat it in peace. Now onhis way home he had to cross a plank lying cross arunning brook. As he crossed, he looked down and sawhis own shadow reflected in the water beneath. Thinkingit was another dog with another piece of meat, he madeup his mind to have that also. So he made a snap at theshadow in the water, but as he opened his mouth thepiece of meat fell out, dropped into the water and wasnever seen more.

Beware lest you lose the substance by grasping at theshadow.

And the Corrective Feedback Treatment Procedures were as follows:
1. First, the teacher handed out the story with an empty writing sheetattached to it and told the students that they were going to read thestory and then rewrite the story.
2. Students were asked to read the story silently.
3. The teacher explained key words and discussed the moral of thestory with the class.
4. The teacher then collected the stories by asking the students to tearoff the story part and keep the writing sheet only.
5. Before asking the students to rewrite the story, the teacher read thestory aloud once while the students noted down key words.
6. Then the students were asked to rewrite the story as closely as theycould remember but in a step backward in the time.
7. The teacher collected the students' written narratives which werethen handed to the researcher.
8. The researcher corrected the narratives focusing mainly on verb tenseerrors based on the correction guidelines.
9. In the following class , the students tookpart in a corrective feedback session during which they received theirnarratives with corrections. The students were asked to look overtheir errors and the corrections carefully for at least 5 minutes. And the teacher explained again the difference between the structures of the verb tenses in Persian and English again to them.

Testing Instruments
Two types of tests were used to measure the acquisition of this study, one was a narrative test and the other was an error correction test. We used the same tests for both, pretest and the posttest. But in the case of the error correction test, we changed the order of the items. As the aim of the classes were to teach speaking and writing the second language mainly and not the translation, there was no question in Persian, or any kind of translation test.

Data Analysis Technique
Since in this study we only had one group of 30 students and no control group, the only analysis used was comparing the Means and SDs of the pretest and the posttest of the same group to see if there was any change because of the treatment given, or not.

Results and Conclusion
In order to make it easier to compare the scores of all the tests were out of 20. And the scores are as follows:

Table 1: Scores of the Participants on the error correction test on the pretest and the post test and their relative mean

Participant NO.	Pretest	Posttest
1	19	20
2	19	20
3	18	20
4	18	18
5	17	19
6	17	19
7	17	19
8	17	18
9	17	18
10	16	18
11	15	18
12	15	17
13	15	16
14	15	15
15	15	13
16	15	13
17	14	19
18	14	17
19	14	17
20	14	16
21	14	14
22	13	18
23	13	18
24	12	17
25	12	16
26	12	15
27	11	15
28	11	9
29	11	8
30	10	14
N= 30	M= 14.66	M=16.46
	SD= 2.49	SD= 2.94

Table 2: The result of the participants on the narrative tests in the pretest and the posttest, and the relative means

Participant NO.	Pretest	Posttest
1	19	20
2	19	20
3	18	20
4	18	19
5	17	19
6	17	19
7	17	16
8	17	15
9	16	20
10	16	20
11	16	19

12	16	19
13	15	19
14	15	15
15	15	14
16	15	14
17	14	16
18	14	16
19	13	15
20	13	15
21	13	12
22	13	11
23	13	11
24	13	11
25	12	16
26	12	15
27	12	15
28	12	14
29	11	15
30	11	15
N= 30	M= 14.73	M= 16.16
	SD= 2.36	SD= 2.90

As it is obvious, in both tests, the error correction test and the narrative test, there was an improvement in the mean and the standard deviation.

Based on the results, the answer to the first research question is Yes, since there was an improvement in the scores of the participants, it can be concluded that a focused corrective feedback of contrastive analysis on the verb tenses in beneficial for language teaching.

And as an answer to the second question, it can be stated that, the hypothesis is correct, and the teachers can use this method, WCF, and reviewing the verb tense structures of the two languages (here, Persian and English) in their classes of higher levels.

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND APPLICATION

There are some factors influencing the results of the current study, which worth mentioning. First of all, the participants of this study are the students of two classes who received the treatments by two different teachers, and in different contexts, which might have had influence on the treatment and the two tests.

As Chandler (2004) noted about Truscott's (1996, 2004)criticism of written CF, the controversy surrounding the effectiveness ofwritten CF can only be resolved through carefully designed studies:I accept [his] argument that the efficacy of error correction for accuracyof subsequent writing can only be demonstrated by studies containing acontrol group which receives no correction and experimental groupswhich correct their errors after either receiving direct correction or havingthe location of their errors pointed out. So I hope someone will dosuch a well-designed study(p. 348).

And as Sheen (2007) and Ellis and Sheen (2008) have investigated based on this notion, it's believed that a favorite result is possible to occur when the investigation is well designed.

FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There are some aspects of the research based on knowing and teaching contrastive analysis which is good to work on, especially in the form of WCF. For example, the differences between the usage of the linking verbs plus adjectives in Persian and English.

And also, it is possible to lead research on the effect of the focused corrective feedback on the other aspects of the ESL pedagogy and other components of the grammar, in both oral and written form of the CF with the help of the contrastive analysis knowledge.

There is also this possibility to conduct a research in the form of a translation of perfect tenses with the same structure of the current research.

REFERENCES

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multi-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? Journal of Second Language Writing, 9(3), 227–257.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17, 102–118.

Bitchener, J. and U. Knoch. 2008. 'The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students'. Language Teaching Research Journal 12/3: 409–31.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2008).The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. Language Teaching Research, 12, 409– 431.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2009a). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. System, 37, 322–329.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 14, 191–205

Carroll, J. B. (1981). Twenty-five years of research in foreign language aptitude. In K. Diller (Ed.), Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude (pp. 83–118). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Chandler, J. (2000, March). The efficacy of error correction for improvement in the accuracy of L2 student writing. Paper presented at the AAAL conference.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 267–296.

Doughty, C. J., & Varela, E. (1998).Communicative focus on form.In C. J. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 114–138). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. J. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form.In P. Robinson (Ed.), Cognition and second language instruction (pp. 206–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

DeKeyser, R. (1993) The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. Modern Language Journal, 77, 501–514.

Doughty, C. J., (2003). Instructed SLA: constraints, compensation and enhancement. In C. J. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition (256–310). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. ,Loewen, S. , &Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28, 339 – 368 .

Ellis, R., Erlam, R. &Loewen, S. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28, 339–368.

Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., &Wolfersberger, M. (2010).Contextualizingcorrective feedback in L2 writing pedagogy. Language Teaching Research ,14, 445–463.

Fathman, A., &Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp. 178–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (1997).The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. TESOL Quarterly, 31, 315–339.

Ferris, D. R. (2002).Treatment of error in second language student writing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. 1999. 'The case for grammar correction in L2writing classes.A response to Truscott (1996)'. Journal of Second LanguageWriting 8/1: 1–10.

Ferris, D. R., &Helt, M. (2000, March 11–14).Was Truscott right?New evidence on the effects of error correction in L2 writing classes. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing, 10, 161–184.

Fisiak, J. (1981). Some introductory notes concerning contrastive linguistics.In J. Fisiak (Ed.),Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher (pp. 1-13). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. TESOL Quarterly, 44, 84–109.

Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogical correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 16, 40–53.

Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), The handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 224–255). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hattie, J., &Timperley, H. (2007).The power of feedback.Review of Educational Research, 77, 81– 112.

Havranek, G., &Cesnik, H. (2001).Factors affecting the success of corrective feedback. In S. H. Foster- Cohen & A. Nizegorodcew (Eds.), EUROSLA yearbook, 1, (pp. 99–122). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2002).Feedback on second language students' writing. Language Teaching, 39, 83–101. James, C. (1980). Contrastive analysis. London: Longman.

James, C. (1998). Errors in language learning and use. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. The Modern Language Journal, 75, 305–313.

Komura, K. (1999). Student response to error correction in ESL classrooms.Master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento.

Lado , R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures. Ann Arbor: university of Michigan Press.

Lalande, J. (1984). Reducing composition errors: An experiment.Foreign Language Annals, 17, 109– 117.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. Modern Language Journal, 66, 140–149.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991).An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research. London: Longman.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. Foreign Language Annals, 24, 203–218.

Loewen, S., &Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in adult English L2 classrooms: Characteristics, explicitness and effectiveness. Modern Language Journal, 90, 536–555.

Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. Modern Language Journal, 82, 357–371.

Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms.Language Learning, 48,183–218.

Lyster, R. (2004). Different effects of prompts and effects in form-focused instruction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26, 399–432.

Lyster, R., &Ranta, L. (1997).Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19, 37–66.

Nassaji, H. (2007). Elicitation and Reformulation and their Relationship with Learner Repair in Dyadic Interaction, Language Learning, 57, 4, 511-548.

Nassaji, H. (2009). The Effects of Recasts and Elicitations in Dyadic Interaction and the Role of Feedback Explicitness. Language Learning, 59, 411-452.

Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M. ,&Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners . Language Learning, 51, 719–758.

Odlin, T. (1989). Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Polio, C. & Sachs, R. (2007).Learners' use of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 29, 67–100.

Robb, T., Ross, S., &Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 83–91.

Roberts, B. J. (1999). Can error logs raise more than consciousness? The effects of error logs and grammar feedback on ESL students' final drafts. Master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento.

Robinson, P. (2007). Aptitudes, abilities, contexts, and practice.In R. M. DeKeyser (Ed.), Practice in a second language.Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology (pp. 256-286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Russell, J., &Spada, N. (2006).The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar.In J. Norris (Ed.), Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching (pp. 133–163). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Sajavaara, K. (1981). Contrastive linguistics past and present and a communicative approach.InJ. Fisiak (Ed.), Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher (pp. 33-56). Oxford: PergamonPress.

Sawyer, M., &Ranta, L. (2001).Aptitude, individual differences, and instructional design.In P. Robinson (Ed.), Cognition and second language acquisition (pp. 319–353). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning.Applied Linguistics, 11, 129–158.

Semke, H. 1984. 'The effects of the red pen'. Foreign Language Annals 17/3: 195–202.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. TESOL Quarterly, 41, 255–283.

Skehan, P. (1998). A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain , M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46, 327–369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Ferris. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8, 111–122.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. Journal of Second Language Writing, 16, 255–272.

Yoon, E. (2002, December). The Effect of Second Language Experience on the Acquisition of American English /E/ and /Ɵ/. Retrieved October 23, 2004, from
http://www.asu.edu/clas/english/inguistics/Eun%20Kyung%20Yoon/body%20I%20(intro, lit).doc

Zamel, V. (1985).Responding to student writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79–101.

Appendix
Error Correction Test
Please read each statement. Each statement has two sentences that are related. One of thesentences is underlined. The underlined sentence contains at least one error. There may bemore than one error in each underlined sentence. Write out the underlined sentence correctingall the errors. (Note: There are no punctuation or spelling errors.)

Example 1: Gloria have lived in New York during 2001. She really enjoys living in
New York.
Answer: Gloria has lived in New York since 2001.
Example 2: John has got a cold. He couldn't went to school today.
Answer: He hasn't gone to school today.

1. Mary used to living in Chicago since 1998. She lives in New York now.

2. I look after a little girl and a little boy on Saturday. A little girl has been with others before but theboy hasn't.

3. I 'll take three tests tomorrow. I will be finished the tests this time tomorrow.

4. Tom quits smoking before I met him . He started smoking again because he is too stressed out.

5. There might been many ways to get to John's house since the reconstruction of the town . Can you show me his house on the map?

6. I saw a man in a car across the street by the sandwich bar. I realized that the man will has have a sandwich in 5 minutes.

7. Jen and Brad used to be so happy together. I couldn't believe that they broke up for 6 months now.

8. I saw a very interesting movie last night. Then I remembered that I saw this movie before.

9. Last night I read a magazine and a news article. I don't know where the news article was before.

10. A young woman and a tall man were talking outside my house. From their voices I guessed that in ten minutes,the young woman would leftthe tall man.

11. I read that book about New York. And I know that the author is from California.

12. We rented a boat last summer. Unfortunately, boat hit another boat before that and we didn't know anything about it.

13. We will go to the basketball game on Saturday. So when you come we wouldn't be there to open the door.

14. When you turn onto Paramus Road, you will see two houses: a blue one and a yellow one.I lived in a blue house since I got married.

15. Be sure that when it is the time to be on the flight to Amsterdam, I told you about my will.